



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/474,783	12/30/1999	DONALD K. NEWELL	2207/6929	2707

23838 7590 08/27/2003

KENYON & KENYON  
1500 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 700  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NALEVANKO, CHRISTOPHER R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/474,783

Applicant(s)

NEWELL ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher R Nalevanko

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 6/9/03 regarding Claims 1, 7, and 19 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that "this supplemental information is only used to enable the use of the program information as already specified and /or enabled by the provider of the program information" (page 10 lines 13-15). Furthermore, Applicant states that "in the Russo system 'several types of supplemental information are possible, including future schedule information,...authorization keys and information relating to compression algorithms'" (page 10 lines 10-12). Examiner agrees that the type of supplemental information is authorization keys and information regarding compression algorithms, but asserts that this information can be read on the limitation of 'embedded control information defining an action to be taken pertaining to said broadcast content' as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 19. The authorization key and compression information are control information defining actions to be taken pertaining to the broadcast content. The authorization key allows the broadcast data to be received, displayed, and manipulated. Furthermore, the compression information tells the receiver the correct way to decompress the information so it can be displayed properly, which is an action performed directly to the broadcast data. Both the authorization key and compression algorithms directly perform actions or operations on the received data.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Art Unit: 2611

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-7 and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Russo.

Regarding Claim 1, Russo shows a system for controlling use of broadcast content comprising a receiver in communications with a source of broadcast content and a playback device, wherein the receiver is configured to control the use of the received broadcast content through the playback device in accordance with control information embedded in the broadcast content (col. 3 lines 3-28 and 50-60, col. 6 lines 12-25, col. 8 lines 55-67, see figure 2). Furthermore, the authorization key and compression algorithms directly define actions or operations to be taken pertaining the broadcast data.

Regarding Claim 2, Russo shows that a storage device is couple to the receiver (col. 3 lines 3-20, see figure 1 item 14 'program storage').

Regarding Claim 3, shows that the receiver can store broadcast content in the storage devise based on the control information (col. 3 lines 12-20, col. 4 lines 45-67, col. 6 lines 12-25, col. 9 lines 38-67).

Regarding Claim 4, Russo further shows that the receiver is configured to maintain information relating to the use of the received broadcast content (col. 3 lines 20-25, col. 5 lines 48-65).

Regarding Claim 5, Russo shows that the receiver is configured to use the information relating to the use of the received broadcast content for remuneration of a provider of content (col. 4 lines 45-67, col. 5 lines 20-33, col. 6 lines 34-55).

Regarding Claim 6, Russo shows that the information relating to the use of the received broadcast content comprises a duration of use (col. 5 lines 32-47).

Regarding Claim 7, Russo shows a method for controlling the use of broadcast content comprising receiving broadcast content, extracting control information from the received broadcast content (col. 6 lines 12-32, col. 8 lines 55-67), and controlling the use of the received broadcast content in accordance with the extracted control information (col. 6 lines 12-32, col. 9 lines 48-67, col. 5 lines 34-60, col. 4 lines 45-67). Furthermore, the authorization key and compression algorithms directly define actions or operations to be taken pertaining the broadcast data.

Regarding Claim 10, Russo shows that control information indicates a length of time that the received broadcast content may be consumed (col. 5, lines 32-46).

Regarding Claim 11, Russo shows that control information indicates a time period during which the received broadcast content may be consumed (col. 5, lines 32-46).

Regarding Claim 12, Russo shows that the video can be saved for a predetermined length of time but doesn't specifically state a date range (col. 5, lines 32-46). It is nonetheless inherent that this time period would be more than one day, thus covering a range of dates.

Regarding Claim 13, it is inherent that the information sent to the user site would include billing information (col. 6 lines 10-27).

Art Unit: 2611

Regarding Claim 14, it is inherent that the information sent to the user site would contain information for the cost of consuming the broadcast (col. 6 lines 10-27).

Regarding Claim 15, Russo shows the ability to “unlock” certain viewing options with a code sent along with the video stream (col. 6 lines 10-27). This inherently prevents the unjustified use of the broadcast material since other options would remain locked.

Regarding Claim 16, Russo shows obtaining payment information from the user (col. 6 lines 20-28, lines 35-46, col. 10 lines 10-48).

Regarding Claim 17, Russo shows communicating consumption information to a billing facility (col. 6 lines 34-53, col. 10 lines 10-48).

Regarding Claim 18, Russo shows that the billing facility comprises a facility maintained by a provider of the broadcast content (col. 6 lines 20-36).

Regarding Claim 19, Russo shows a storage medium containing a set of instructions for execution by a computer (see figure 2 items 136, 156, 150, 158). This clearly shows that the invention of Russo is capable of being carried out by a computer controlled medium. All further limitations of the Claim have been addressed in Claim 7.

Regarding Claim 20, it is further understood that the memory shown in Russo is accessible by a computer.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2611

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo.

Regarding Claim 9, Russo does show lengths of time and days that the broadcast may be viewed (col.5 lines 33-48). Russo fails to show that the control information indicates the number of times the received broadcast content may be consumed. Limiting the number of times is a logical variation of the restriction of viewing already set forth by Russo and therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. This would enable the broadcast facility to supply the viewer with various pricing and viewing options.

Regarding Claim 21, Russo fails to show that the storage medium comprises a portable storage device. Official Notice is taken that it is well known and expected in the art to use removable storage devices, such as CD-ROMs or removable hard drives. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Russo with a portable storage device so that the instructions could be transported to other systems.

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo in further view of Horton et al.

Regarding Claim 8, Russo fails to teach that the control information comprises authorization to store the received broadcast content. Horton teaches a code that is sent to the receiver that indicates whether a program may be stored or not (col. 2 lines 30-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2611

was made to modify the system of Russo with the restrictive storing of Horton so that programs that were not intended to be stored could not be recorded by the user.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R Nalevanko whose telephone number is 703-305-8093. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Application/Control Number: 09/474,783

Page 8

Art Unit: 2611

Christopher Nalevanko

AU 2611

703-305-8093

cn

August 25, 2003



ANDREW FAILE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600